INTHEUNITEDSTATESDISTRICTCOURT FORTHEEASTERNDISTRICTOFPENNSYLVANIA

UNITEDSTATESOFAMERICA v.	CRIMINALACTION
	No.99-362-1
ALBERTOHERNANDEZ,	
a/k/aALBERTOLOPEZ,	
Defendant.	

MEMORANDUMANDORDER

Katz,S.J. March20,2002

 $This Motion raises the issue of defense counsel's in effectiveness for failing to \\ raise the constitutionality of the statute for bidding the possession of a fire arm by a convicted felon. 18U.S.C. § 922(g).$

 $Following a hearing on defendant's Motion to Suppress, this court denied the \\Motion and the Court of Appeals affirmed following defendant's guilty pleaand sentence. The \\we aponinque stion was manufacture doutside of Pennsylvania.$

Theconstitutional challengehasbeenrejected. The statute is a constitutional exercise of Congress' authority under the Commerce Clause. *United Statesv. Gateward*, 84F.3d 670(3dCir.1996), *cert.denied*, 519U.S.907(1996); *United Statesv. Singletary*, 268F.3d196 (3dCir.2001).

AnappropriateOrderfollows.

INTHEUNITEDSTATESDISTRICTCOURT FORTHEEASTERNDISTRICTOFPENNSYLVANIA

UNITEDSTATESOFAMERICA v. ALBERTOHERNANDEZ, a/k/aALBERTOLOPEZ, Defendant.	CRIMINALACTION No.99-362-1
ORDE	<u> </u>
ANDNOW, this 20 th day of March, 20	02,uponconsiderationofdefendant's
$Motion Under 28 U.S.C. \S 2255 and the response, it is heart of the contraction of the c$	ereby ORDERED thatthesaidMotion
is DENIED .	
Thereisnobasistoissueacertificateofap	ppealability.
ВҮТН	ECOURT:
MARV	/INKATZ,S.J.